

# Sexual orientation discrimination in the labor market against gay men

## Abstract

The study replicates the first European field experiment on gay men's labor market prospects in Greece. Utilizing the same protocol as the original study in 2006-2007, two follow-up field experiments took place in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019. The study estimated that gay men experienced occupational access constraints and wage sorting in vacancies offering lower remuneration. It was found that in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, gay men experienced increasingly biased treatment compared to 2006-2007. Moreover, the results suggested that unemployment bore an association with occupational access constraints and wage sorting in vacancies offering lower remuneration for gay men. In each of the three experiments, this study captured recruiters' attitudes toward gay men. A one standard deviation increase in taste-discrimination attitudes against gay men decreased their access to occupations by 9.6%. Furthermore, a one standard deviation increase in statistical-discrimination attitudes against gay men decreased their access to occupations by 8.1%. According to the findings, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, firms excluding gay applicants expressed a higher level of taste- and statistical-discrimination attitudes compared to 2006-2007. A gay rights backlash due to the LGBTIQ+ group's attempt to advance its agenda, rising far-right rhetoric, and prejudice associated with economic downturns experienced in Greece might correspond with increasing biases against gay men. The current study contributes to the economics of sexual orientation when an economy deteriorates.

**Keywords:** Field experiment, Sexual orientation, Hiring discrimination, Wage sorting, Replication, Backlash, Unemployment, Economic recession

**JEL classification:** C93, J7, J16, J31, J42, J64, J71, J83

Nick Drydakis<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Economics, Centre for Pluralist Economics, Faculty of Business and Law, East Road, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, CB 1 1PT, the UK

<sup>2</sup> Pembroke College, University of Cambridge, the UK

<sup>3</sup> Centre for Science and Policy, University of Cambridge, the UK

<sup>4</sup> Global Labor Organization, Essen, Germany

<sup>5</sup> Institute of Labor Economics, IZA, Bonn, Germany

[nick.drydakis@aru.ac.uk](mailto:nick.drydakis@aru.ac.uk) & [nick.drydakis@pem.cam.ac.uk](mailto:nick.drydakis@pem.cam.ac.uk)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9827-6678>

## 1. Introduction

The existence of economic disparities between heterosexual and gay men can perhaps be put down to homophobia (Badgett, 2020; Valfort, 2020; OECD, 2019; Drydakis, 2019; Hammarstedt et al., 2015). Gay men encounter unique challenges such as exclusion, bullying, and poverty (Badgett, 2020; Drydakis and Zimmermann, 2020; OECD, 2019; Drydakis, 2019; Hammarstedt et al., 2015; Orefice, 2011; Zavodny, 2008). A 2021 meta-analysis found that, between 1991-2018, gay and bisexual men, earned less than heterosexual men (Drydakis, 2021). There are scarce data sets capturing socioeconomic patterns for LGBTIQ+ people, and Greece is no exception (Drydakis, 2019). For instance, the first European field experiment on gay men's labor market prospects took place in Greece between 2006 and 2007 (Drydakis, 2009). Since then, no further field research was conducted in the country, making it impossible to assess whether a change in gay men's societal approval and labor market outcomes occurred.

Assessing whether discrimination drives inferior labor market outcomes for minority population groups has drawn the attention of economists for decades (Badgett, 2020; Neumark, 2018). Based on the taste for discrimination theory (Becker, 1957; 1993), employers might want to maintain a physical distance from certain minority groups because they dislike transacting with them. The theory indicates that discrimination coefficients incorporate the influence of characteristics unrelated to productivity, such as homophobic attitudes against gay men (Drydakis, 2014). Moreover, the theory indicates that if employers are homophobic, they might pay minorities lower wages for similar productivity to compensate for the psychological loss they experience in associating with members of such groups. If the distastes for the gay men is high enough, employers might decide not to employ them in their firms.

The statistical discrimination theory (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973; 1998) proposes that the usage of average group characteristics to predict individual productivity and set corresponding wages can incorrectly evaluate the productivity of workers who are atypical of their minority demographic characteristic. If employers' uncertainty regarding gay men's productivity and work commitment is strong, they might decide not to employ gay men to their works. These acts are not based specifically on distastes toward a class of individuals but rather are grounded in what the employers believe to be valid inferences about productivity. For instance, if gay men do not conform to traditional gender norms related to masculinity and leadership, such a situation might result in unfavorable evaluations (Drydakis, 2015a).

This study aims to offer updated Greek patterns by replicating Drydakis (2009). Utilizing the same protocol as the original study in 2006-2007, two follow-up field experiments took place in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019. The present study contributes to the literature. This is the first paper to replicate the protocol of a previously conducted correspondence test to assess whether a minority

population group performs better or worse six years and eleven years respectively after the original study. Hence, the present study proposes an assessment of potential changes in labor market experiences by replicating the research protocol of previously conducted evaluations. Moreover, by approaching the recruiters in each of the three experiments, this study captures their attitudes toward gay men. Such a feature enables an empirical assessment of whether recruiters' attitudes bear a relationship with gay men's access to occupations and wage sorting. This is the first field experiment on sexual orientation to collect related information with a view to capturing critical insights, such as by quantifying the association between different predictions of discrimination (taste- and statistical-discrimination) on gay men's access to occupations. Identifying potential driven factors of workplace bias against gay men should be of interest to policy-makers.

The findings of the present study indicate that in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 gay men experience occupational access constraints and wage sorting in vacancies offering lower remuneration. The outcomes posit that, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, gay men experienced increasing biased treatments compared to these in 2006-2007. Moreover, the outcomes indicate that monthly unemployment is associated with occupational access constraints and wage sorting in vacancies offering lower remuneration for gay men. Furthermore, the study provides insights indicating an increase in recruiters' taste- and statistical- discrimination attitudes against gay men which might be correlated with decreased labor market prospects for gay men. The study indicates that a gay rights backlash due to LGBTIQ+ group's attempt to advance its agenda, a rising level of far-right rhetoric and increasing prejudice associated with the Greek economic crisis might bear a relationship with increasing biased treatments against gay men.

Changes in legislation are likely to impact social attitudes (Drabble et al., 2021). Possible effects could range from actions to rescind rights to the potential expansion of rights (Drabble, 2021). In Greece, the legalization of same-sex partnerships in 2015 might have caused a negative reaction that adversely affected gay men. Moreover, due to economic struggles and anxiety over the Greek economic recession, a far-right political party gained ground in the 2012 (7%) and 2015 (9.4%) parliamentary elections. This party embraced the following components: militant nationalism, the exaltation of virility, and racism (Psarras, 2015; Papadimitriou, 2014). Homosexuality was perceived as shameful and socially deviant, and LGBTIQ+ people became the 'shame' of the nation (Racist Violence Recording Network, 2018; Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015; Sroiter, 2014; Carastathis, 2015). The rising far-right rhetoric might have contributed to homophobic attitudes. Additionally, economic struggles can trigger uncertainty and kindle animosity (Baker et al., 2016; Bianchi, 2016). International studies evaluated that prejudices against minorities are counter-cyclical and rise during periods of higher unemployment for majorities (Vargas et al., 2018; Bianci et al., 2018; Jayadev and Johnson, 2017; Mayda, 2006). In

Greece, rising economic pressures and unemployment might bear an association with biases toward gay men. In the present context, the gay rights backlash and far-right rhetoric are empirically indistinguishable from prejudices related to economic conditions.

Fluctuations in homophobia and gay men's labor market prospects should interest policy-makers attempting to address the circumstances of groups that suffer workplace disadvantages. The remainder of the study is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a brief literature review on Greek patterns on the subject matter domain, and experimental techniques to capture labor market discrimination. Section 3 presents the study's experimental design and the data gathering process. Section 4 presents descriptive statistics. Section 5 presents the estimates. The final section provides a discussion and concludes the study.

## **2. Literature review**

### *2.1 Greek patterns*

Only four studies exist on sexual orientation and labor market outcomes in Greece. All the studies focused on the capital city, Athens. Drydakis' (2009) field experiment found that gay men experienced 26% lower occupational access than their heterosexual counterparts. A further field experiment for lesbian women in 2007-2008 indicated that they experienced 27% occupational access constraints than straight women (Drydakis, 2011). Furthermore, they were sorted into occupations offering 6% lower wages than heterosexual women (Drydakis, 2011). A study utilizing administrative data for the period 2008-2009 revealed that gay men experienced 8.1% higher unemployment and 4.4% lower wages than comparable heterosexual men and that bisexual men experienced 8.8% higher unemployment and 5.2% lower wages than their comparable heterosexual counterparts (Drydakis, 2012). Moreover, a study utilizing administrative data for the period 2008-2010 found that gay men and lesbian women faced lower job satisfaction than comparable heterosexual men and women (Drydakis, 2015b).

The 2019 Eurobarometer survey suggested that more homophobia exists in Greece than the EU28 average (Eurobarometer, 2019). The findings indicate that 53% of Greeks believed that a sexual relationship between two people of the same gender is wrong. The EU28 average figure was 24%. In addition, 64% of Greek people believed that gay, lesbian, and bisexual people should have access to the same rights as heterosexual people. However, the EU28 average was 76%. Furthermore, 12% of Greeks would feel comfortable if their colleagues at work were gay, lesbian, or bisexual. The EU28 average was found to be 26%. OECD (2019) indicated that Greece experienced a decreased acceptance of homosexuality.

Since 2010, although sexual orientation differences became more pronounced in Greece, rising levels of ethnonationalism and neoconservative rhetoric created a phobic atmosphere and

jeopardized people's rights (Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015). For instance, the 4356/2015 Law legalized same-sex partnerships in December 2015 and saw LGBTIQ+ activism and gay pride in big cities become more visible than ever, this political mobilization occurred simultaneously with increased homophobia (Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015). The inquiry about if and how recognition of same-sex civil partnerships may have changed Greeks' understandings about LGBTIQ+ rights, and family formations have not received attention in the literature.

Since 2010 in Greece, harsh austerity programs to correct macroeconomic imbalances resulted in the GDP dropping by 25%, the unemployment rate rising by approximately 16 percentage points, and 36% of the population facing poverty (Papanastasiou and Papatheodorou, 2018; Drydakakis, 2015c; Papatheodorou, 2014; International Monetary Fund, 2013). Nine years later, in 2019, the country's unemployment rate continued to be double the figure (18%) compared to the one before the onset of the economic recession (9%), indicating the existence of a recession (Eurostat, 2019). Internationally, there are no assessments of how an economic recession could bear a connection with LGBTIQ+ people's experiences and labor market performance. However, reportages in the popular international press indicated that homophobia in Greece escalated during the period of economic recession<sup>1</sup>.

Between 2012 and 2014 in Athens, verbal abuse and physical violence against LGBTIQ+ people increased (Sroiter, 2014). Organized street gangs were formed, and persecutions against LGBTIQ+ people took place across the country (Sroiter, 2014). The phenomenon acquired the label 'barrage of homophobic violence' and became associated with the adverse political and socioeconomic effects of the economic recession in the region (Sroiter, 2014).

According to Eleftheriadis (2015), the austerity measures and poverty were accompanied by the rise of a far-right political party<sup>2</sup>. Its members' neofascism rhetoric legitimized within the public sphere racism and homophobia, and a violent repressive deployment of police forces took place against marginalized groups including immigrants, trans people, and sex workers (Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015; Carastathis, 2015). LGBTIQ+ people became the 'shame' of the nation and returned to their position as the 'others' in a more violent and visible way than before (Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2015). The 2018 annual report of the Racist Violence Recording Network (2018)

---

<sup>1</sup> Examples from the popular press include BBC News, 2 October 2013; The Guardian, 7 September 2014; The New York Times, 5 October 2015; Deutsche Welle, 2 May 2017; The EU Observer, 28 Mai 2018; TRT World, 19 April 2019; The Independent, 1 March 2019.

<sup>2</sup> In the 2012 parliamentary elections the party won 7% of the vote, finished third in the 2014 European elections (9.4%), and gained third place in the parliamentary elections of 2015 (6.4%). During the 2019 European elections the political party won 4.8% of the vote and during the 2019 parliamentary election lost all of its seats in the Hellenic Parliament, winning only 2.93% of the vote.

revealed increased homophobic attacks, aggressiveness, and anger since 2015 due to rising far-right rhetoric and extreme nationalism. The economic recession heightened peripheries within Greece's territorial, a process that articulated gendered relations of power (Carastathis, 2015). Attacks on LGBTIQ+ people, were indicated to be not a side effect, but a central dimension of a hostile social climate (Carastathis, 2015).

The Appendix provides a time trend of key macroeconomic variables alongside major events that relate to LGBTQ+ issues in Greece.

## *2.2 Correspondence tests*

Correspondence testing represents a method of measuring discrimination in natural settings during the initial stage of application screening and selection. This approach is considered one of the most reliable methods of testing for workplace discrimination (Neumark, 2018; Baert, 2018; Riach and Rich, 2002). Correspondence testing can provide evidence of discrimination because the impact of unobserved differences in employee commitment, motivation, productivity, and personality characteristics tend not to affect firms' screening processes. These findings are especially true when compared with studies assessing qualitative data on discriminatory experiences, regression-based decomposition approaches on employment and wage differences (Neumark, 2018; Drydakis, 2015a; Riach and Rich, 2002; Weichselbaumer, 2003).

A typical correspondence test on sexual orientation involves sending matched pairs of job applications, comprising cover letters and CVs, in response to advertised vacancies in order to assess hiring discrimination in the labor market at the initial stage of candidate selection (Flage, 2020). Studies match applications on demographic characteristics such as sex, age, ethnicity, education, experiences, and marital status. The applications have to be similar in all relevant respects, with the only different characteristic between the applications being sexual orientation (Weichselbaumer, 2003). Then, the two applications are sent to the same firm, with the degree of discrimination measured by calculating the difference in the number of interview invitations that members of each group receive (Riach and Rich, 2002).

Since Drydakis' (2009) work, different correspondence tests on gay men's workplace prospects have taken place. In the US, Tilcsik (2011) found occupational access barriers, or discrimination, against male applicants who appeared to be gay. Comparable patterns for gay men hold in the UK (Drydakis, 2015a), Italy (Patacchini et al., 2015), Sweden (Ahmed et al., 2013), and Cyprus (Drydakis, 2014). According to Drydakis (2019), sexual orientation penalties against gay men in relation to access to job vacancies vary between 3% and 40%. In a meta-analysis of sexual orientation correspondence tests, Flage (2020) found more discrimination in relation to low-skilled jobs than for high-skilled roles. In the studies, sexual orientation was signaled through experience in

a gay campus organization (Drydakis, 2015a; Tilcsik, 2011), participation in a gay or lesbian organization (Patacchini et al., 2015; Drydakis, 2009; 2011; 2014), and by revealing the gender of the applicant's spouse (Ahmed et al., 2013). Correspondence studies also detected wage sorting into lower-paid vacancies against sexual orientation minorities, on top of hiring bias. In Greece (Drydakis, 2009), Cyprus (Drydakis, 2014), and the UK (Drydakis, 2015), labeled gay men received interviews for vacancies offering lower wages. The wage sorting pattern experienced by gay men could explain part of the wage inequality gay men experience in the labor market (Drydakis, 2019).

Correspondence testing studies provide noteworthy insights. According to Drydakis (2015a), in the UK, labeled gay applicants received fewer invitations to interviews in posts highlighting typically masculine personality traits such as leadership and assertiveness. It is suggested that firms that seek employees with stereotypically masculine traits will be more likely to discriminate against gay men if they value attributes that gay men are stereotypically perceived to lack (Drydakis, 2015a; Connell, 2005). Comparable patterns are observed in the US field experiment (Tilcsik, 2011). In Cyprus, studies found that enhancing gay men's cognitive skills, previous job responsibilities, and work commitment in the application cannot reduce biased treatments (Drydakis, 2014). Thus, taste- rather than statistical-discrimination against gay men might have driven the patterns. Moreover, studies in Sweden found that stronger sexual orientation biases exist in the private sector, and gay applicants experience discrimination in typically male-dominated occupations (Ahmed et al., 2013).

### **3. Experiments and data gathering**

From December 2013 to September 2014 and December 2018 to September 2019, this study replicated Drydakis' (2009) field experiment which occurred between December 2006 and September 2007. The experiments took place in Athens with the aim of quantifying the level of potential occupational access discrimination, and wage sorting in lower-paid vacancies, against gay applicants during the initial stage of the hiring process.

Aligning with Drydakis (2009), this study created two fictitious job applications: one for a gay-labeled worker, namely, a perceived gay worker, and one for a non-gay-labeled worker, namely, a perceived heterosexual worker. Both had comparable human capital and working experiences and applied for the same job opening. Based on Drydakis' (2009) research protocol, researchers used a random routine to select job openings that appeared on newspaper websites. The next stage of the process saw applications sent for those job openings which highlighted employment for eight hours a day, five days a week. All experiments focused on low-skilled jobs in the private sector with no higher education requirements. This profile of workers is seen as more at

risk of experiencing biased treatments than better-skilled workers (OECD, 2019). Moreover, the public sector is more weakly constrained by profitability requirements than in the private sector and biases might be lower (Laurent and Mihoubi, 2012; Kara, 2006; Hoffnar and Greene, 1996). Thus, a focus on young and less-educated population groups in the private sector shall merit consideration in experimental studies (Drydakis, 2009; 2011). Both applicants were young, did not have a higher education degree, and had working experience in the private sector. Additionally, they were applying for jobs in the private sector. This study saw applications sent for job openings in a variety of sectors, namely, in office jobs, industry jobs, café and restaurant services, and shop sales.

The two applicants were Greeks with distinctive Greek male first and last names and had carried out military service in different areas. Both applicants were 29 years old and unmarried. They had nine years of work experience in positions similar to the post for which they applied and had finished high school approximately 12 years before. Real home addresses, high schools, and previous workplaces were located in different areas within Athens. However, particular attention was paid to the areas indicating a comparable social class. Finally, both applications included similar hobbies, such as sports and travel, and personal characteristics, such as productivity, sociability, and efficiency.

In all three experiments, a perceived minority sexual orientation was indicated in the personal information section of the curriculum vitae. Here, the applicant mentioned a previous volunteering role in the Athenian Homosexual Community. This resume formed the gay-labeled application. In the other curriculum vitae, no explicit information on sexual orientation was provided. This formed the application from a perceived heterosexual applicant. Furthermore, in case the gay-labeled applicant's activism might have found bias in the screening process, the heterosexual applicant's curriculum vitae also mentioned past volunteering experience in an environmental community. For the heterosexual applicant, the control environmental community was chosen because it did not give any evidence of being a gay man. To control for the probability that the volunteer activities might have created a conflict with workers' present duties, both resumes indicated the conclusion of those activities. The nature of the provided information is a typical approach in correspondent tests examining potential sexual orientation bias (Patacchini et al., 2015; Drydakis, 2015a; 2009; Ahmed et al., 2013; Tilcsik, 2011).

The application forms were sent simultaneously within one day of the advertisement's appearance. The firms received application submissions through emails, and/or fax, and/or electronic standardized forms. In the latter case, applicants had the opportunity to upload their cover letter and curriculum vitae. To avoid detection of the experiments, the cover letters and curriculum vitae utilized distinct styles for the two applicants. In case the style of an application could influence a firm's preference, the application form styles were equally allocated between the two



applicants. In addition, applications were sent at different times. In half of the cases, the heterosexual worker's application was sent first. In the regression, this study included controls for sending type, order, and CV style. The CVs featured two different emails and mobile telephone numbers. Firms had the opportunity to leave a voice message. Furthermore, male members of the research team could return missed calls and record invitations for interviews.

All three experiments featured measurements of the potential existence of discrimination against gay applicants by firms if the proportion of times they received an invitation for interviews were statistically significantly different from those of heterosexual applicants. The experiments also recorded the entry-level annual wages of the vacancies if the job openings featured this information. If gay applicants were invited for an interview in firms offering statistically significant lower wages than the wages experienced by heterosexual applicants, this indicates a pattern of wage sorting into lower-paid jobs due to a minority sexual orientation (Drydakis, 2011; Drydakis, 2015a).

## 4. Descriptive statistics

### 4.1 Access to occupations

Table 1 presents the results for access to occupations, or the call for interviews. Panel I shows the period 2006-2007's outcomes (Experiment I). Panel II demonstrates the period 2013-2014's results (Experiment II), and Panel III offers the period 2018-2019's results (Experiment III). All panels offer information per sector as well as aggregate results. The study reports different outcomes, such as 'the number of job openings', 'neither of the two applicants invited', 'at least one applicant invited', 'both applicants invited', 'only heterosexual men invited', and 'only gay men invited'. The difference between the cases where 'only heterosexual men invited' and 'only gay men invited' is divided by the cases where 'at least one invited' constitutes the so-called net discrimination (Drydakis, 2009).

[Table 1]

Panel I reveals that in the period 2006-2007, in 457 cases only heterosexual men were invited for an interview, whereas in nine cases only gay men were invited. The net discrimination against gay men is 64.3% ( $\chi^2=430.6$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Panel II shows that in the period 2013-2014, the net discrimination against gay men stands at 89.6% ( $\chi^2=359.0$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Panel III presents that in the period 2018-2019, the net discrimination against gay men is 87.0% ( $\chi^2=244.1$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

Comparing the three experiments, the lowest net discrimination against gay men is observed in the period 2006-2007. The highest net discrimination against gay men is observed in the period 2013-2014. The econometric specification will enable an examination of whether the assigned differences are statistically significant when considering sectors' heterogeneity.

## 4.2 Wages

Table 2 presents the wage outcomes of the three experiments and shows the aggregate outcomes and outcomes per sector. Wage differences based on sexual orientation are also offered. Panel I observes that in the period 2006-2007 (Experiment 1), heterosexual men received invitations for an interview from jobs that offered an hourly net wage to the order of €4.4. Gay men received invitations for an interview from jobs that offered an hourly net wage to the order of €4.1. The raw statistics indicate that gay men experienced a 6.5% wage penalty, or that gay men are sorted in lower-paid vacancies than heterosexual men. The difference is statistically significant ( $t=5.18$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

[Table 2]

Panel II reveals that in the period 2013-2014 (Experiment II), heterosexual men received invitations for an interview from jobs offering an hourly net wage equal to €4.0, while gay men received invitations to interview for jobs offering an hourly net wage equal to €3.7. It is estimated that gay men experience an 8.3% wage penalty ( $t=6.1$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

Panel III indicates that in the period 2018-2019 (Experiment III), heterosexual men received invitations to interview for jobs offering an hourly net wage to the order of €4.1, while gay men received invitations to interview for roles offering an hourly net wage equal to €3.7. It is estimated that gay men face a 10.1% wage penalty ( $t=6.4$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The highest wage penalty against gay men is observed in the period 2018-2019 period, followed by wage penalty levels in 2013-2014 and 2006-2007.

## 5. Estimations

To estimate potential differences in access to occupations against gay men, this study utilizes Probit models and reports the marginal effects. Model I presents estimates of the period 2006-2007 (Experiment I), Model II shows the 2013-2014 (Experiment II) estimates, and Model III offers estimates of the period 2018-2019 (Experiment III). Model IV pools the three periods' data and controls for time effects. Then, Model V, through an interaction effect estimate between sexual orientation and periods, captures whether gay men experienced higher occupational access constraints in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 than in 2006-2007. The study adopts a relevant approach to estimate potential wage differences against gay men by employing OLS models. By transforming hourly net wages into  $\ln$  hourly net wages, this research interprets the estimates as percent changes. Interaction effects are offered to estimate whether gay men experience lower wages in certain periods.

### 5.1 Access to occupations

Table 3 presents access to occupation estimates. Model I shows that in the period 2006-2007, gay men experienced 26.4% ( $p<0.01$ ) lower chances of receiving an interview invitation than comparable heterosexual men. Model II demonstrates that in the period 2013-2014, gay men faced 28.0% ( $p<0.01$ ) fewer chances of receiving an invitation for an interview than comparable heterosexual men. Moreover, Model III observes that in the period 2018-2019, gay men faced 30.4% ( $p<0.01$ ) fewer chances of receiving an invitation for an interview than comparable heterosexual men.

[Table 3]

Model IV reveals that in all periods, gay men experience 28.2% ( $p<0.01$ ) fewer chances of receiving an invitation for an interview than comparable heterosexual men. The time controls suggest that in the period 2013-2014, applicants, regardless of their sexual orientation, were 7.1% ( $p<0.01$ ) less likely to receive an invitation for an interview than in 2006-2007. Furthermore, in 2018-2019, applicants, regardless of their sexual orientation, were 6.2% ( $p<0.01$ ) less likely to receive an invitation for an interview than in the period 2006-2007. The difference between the two estimates is statistically insignificant ( $\chi^2=0.64$ ,  $p>0.1$ ). The decrease in invitations for an interview in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 potentially reflects the decline in labor demand experienced during an economic recession.

Model V demonstrates that the interaction effect estimate indicates that gay men, in comparison to heterosexual males, were 9.3% ( $p<0.01$ ) less likely to receive invitations for interviews in 2013-2014 than in 2006-2007. Furthermore, the study shows that in 2018-2019 gay men were 11.1% ( $p<0.01$ ) less likely to receive an invitation for interviews than in 2006-2007. It is found that the difference between the two estimates (2013-2014 vs 2018-2019) is statistically insignificant ( $\chi^2=0.83$ ,  $p>0.1$ ). That is, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 the level of occupational access barriers against gay men remains comparable. If figures from the periods 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 are pooled, the new estimates indicate that gay men were 13.3% ( $p<0.01$ ) less likely to receive invitations for interviews during the 2013-2019 period than in 2006-2007.

### 5.2 Wages

Table 4 offers the wage estimates and follows the same estimation strategy as in Table 3. Model I observes that in 2006-2007 gay men were invited to interview for jobs offering lower wages than those offered to heterosexual men. The estimated wage penalty and/or wage sorting into lower-paid occupations against gay men is equal to 3.9% ( $p<0.01$ ). In Model II, it is observed that in 2013-2014 the wage penalty against gay men is 5.7% ( $p<0.01$ ). In addition, in Model III, an even higher wage penalty against gay men is estimated to the order of 7.1% ( $p<0.01$ ).

[Table 4]

Model IV pools the three periods' data and finds that gay men experience 5.1% ( $p < 0.01$ ) lower wages than heterosexual men. Furthermore, it is estimated that in the period 2013-2014, applicants, regardless of their sexual orientation, received invitations to interview for jobs offering 7% ( $p < 0.01$ ) lower wages than in the 2006-2007 period. In addition, it is estimated that in the period 2018-2019, applicants, regardless of their sexual orientation, were invited to interview for jobs offering 5.3% ( $p < 0.01$ ) lower wages than those offered in the period 2006-2007. The difference between the two estimates remains statistically significant ( $F = 0.78$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The lower wages offered in the periods 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 potentially capture the adverse effects of the economic recession on wage levels.

In Model V, it is observed that the level of wage sorting into lower-paid occupations for gay men between 2006-2007 and 2013-2014 is statistically insignificant ( $-1.8\%$ ,  $p > 0.10$ ). However, the level of wage sorting between the periods 2006-2007 and 2018-2019 is statistically significant. That is, in 2018-2019 gay men, in comparison to heterosexual men, were invited for interviews from firms offering wages 3.2% ( $p < 0.05$ ) lower than in 2006-2007. The difference between the two wage sorting penalties in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 is statistically insignificant ( $F = 0.80$ ,  $p > 0.10$ ). By pooling the data for the periods 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, the estimates suggest that gay men during the 2013-2019 period were invited for interviews from firms offering wages 2.6% ( $p < 0.05$ ) lower than in 2006-2007.

### 5.3 Unemployment on access to occupations and wages

In the original experiment, Experiment I; 2006-2007, the monthly unemployment rate in the country was between 8.3% and 8.6%. In Experiment II; 2013-2014, the monthly unemployment rate was between 26.4% and 27.8%, while in Experiment III; 2018-2019, the monthly unemployment rate was between 16.8% and 18.6%. Given the unemployment differences per period, an interest arose in examining whether, during periods of economic deterioration, sexual orientation minorities experience increased levels of adverse workplace prospects.

Table 5 considers the role of monthly unemployment on access to occupations and wages. The pooled data empirical specifications include the monthly unemployment rate<sup>3</sup>. Model I estimates that a one standard deviation increase in the monthly unemployment rate drops both heterosexual and gay applicants' access to occupations by 0.3% ( $p < 0.01$ ). In Model II, interacting the monthly unemployment rate with the sexual orientation dummy variable shows that a one standard deviation increase in the monthly unemployment rate increases gay men's exclusions from

---

<sup>3</sup> Information on monthly unemployment per sector was not available.

occupations by 0.6% ( $p < 0.01$ ). Model III observes that a one standard deviation increase in the monthly unemployment rate decreases both applicants' wage prospects by 0.3% ( $p < 0.01$ ). In Model IV, interacting the monthly unemployment rate with the sexual orientation dummy indicates that unemployment reduces gay men's wage prospects by 0.1% ( $p < 0.10$ ). The additional specifications indicate the robustness of the patterns in Tables 3 and 4 by utilizing alternative controls to capture adverse economic conditions.

[Table 5]

In Model V, interacting the monthly unemployment rate with the sexual orientation dummy variable and the period 2013-2014, shows that a one standard deviation increase in the monthly unemployment rate increases gay men's exclusions from occupations by 0.3% ( $p < 0.01$ ) in 2013-2014 than in 2006-2007. Moreover, it is found that a one standard deviation increase in the monthly unemployment rate increases gay men's exclusions from occupations by 0.7% ( $p < 0.01$ ) in 2018-2019 than in 2006-2007. Finally, Model VI, indicates that unemployment reduces gay men's wage prospects by 0.1% ( $p < 0.05$ ) in 2018-2019 than in 2006-2007.

#### *5.4 Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men*

Experiment I (2006-2007) involves an attempt to capture potentially biased evaluations against gay men. The research team sent an e-survey questionnaire to those firms that invited both gay and heterosexual applicants (equal treatment cases), those firms that invited only heterosexual applicants (discrimination against gay applicants cases) and those firms that invited only gay applicants (discrimination against heterosexual applicants cases). The firms were informed that a survey was forwarded to them due to their recent advertisement of the vacant position. The survey had questions examining beliefs on demographic population groups such as the elderly, ethnic minorities, people with health limitations, and sexual and gender identity minorities. The questionnaire presented statements requiring firms to comment on whether they agreed in a 5-Likert type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The same procedure took place in Experiment II (2013-2014) and Experiment III (2018-2019). Those who handled the selection process were asked to complete the survey. The response rate in all three Experiments was 27.2%. In Experiment I, none of the nine firms that invited only gay applicants took part in the survey. In Experiment II and III, e-survey questionnaires were not forwarded to those six firms that invited only gay applicants. Hence, the sample consists of observations from firms that invited both gay and heterosexual applicants and those firms that invited only heterosexual applicants.

Five questions (items) were included to capture patterns in relation to biases against sexual orientation. Table 6 shows that the first three questions attempted to capture taste patterns (Becker, 1957; 1993). The first question (item 1) asked whether recruiters believed there is something wrong

in a sexual relationship between two men. Question two (item 2) asked whether male homosexuality is a negative factor in one's life. The third question (item 3) asked whether gay men should hide their sexual orientation in the workplace to protect vocational relationships and the firm's reputation. The fourth question (item 4) asked whether male homosexuality relates to poor performance. The fifth question (item 5) assessed whether respondents believe that male homosexuality bears a relationship to higher employee turnover in terms of gay men. The last two questions potentially represent statistical-discrimination-oriented arguments (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973; 1998). The five questions formed an index entitled '*recruiters attitudes toward gay men*' (RAG index<sup>4</sup>). Higher RAG index scores indicate increasing levels of bias against gay men. The RAG index's Cronbach's alpha coefficient stands at 0.68.

[Table 6]

Table 6 offers statistics per experiment. In Experiment I, the RAG index equals 2.81, in Experiment II, the RAG index equals 3.39, and in Experiment III, the RAG index equals 3.31. The differences between the RAG index in Experiments I and II, and I and III are statistically significant ( $t=-7.66$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; and  $t=-7.74$ ,  $p<0.01$ , respectively). However, the difference between the RAG index in Experiments II and III remains statistically insignificant ( $t=0.75$ ;  $p>0.10$ ).

In all three experiments, the RAG index proves statistically significantly lower for firms inviting both heterosexual and gay applicants for interviews (equal treatment event) than for firms inviting only heterosexual applicants for interviews (discrimination against gay applicants event). For instance, in Experiment I, the RAG index for firms inviting both heterosexual and gay applicants for interviews equals 2.71, however for firms inviting only heterosexual applicants for interviews equals 2.88 ( $t=-2.57$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

A comparison of the RAG index for firms inviting both heterosexual and gay applicants for interviews between Experiment I (; 2.71), Experiment II (; 2.92), and Experiment III (; 2.9) shows that the assigned differences are statistically insignificant<sup>5</sup>. That is, those firms inviting both sets of applicants for an interview had not significantly changed their attitudes toward gay men across the three Experiments. However, by comparing the RAG index for firms that invited only heterosexual applicants between Experiment I (; 2.88), Experiment II (; 3.44), and Experiment III (; 3.38), the differences are statistically significant<sup>6</sup>. That is, in Experiments II and III the level of recruiters'

---

<sup>4</sup> The RAG index is given by:  $RAG\ index = \sum_{i=1}^5 items_i / 5$

<sup>5</sup> Firms inviting both heterosexual and gay applicants for an interview:

The RAG index in Experiment I vs the RAG index in Experiment II:  $t=-1.39$  ( $p>0.10$ );

The RAG index in Experiment I vs the RAG index in Experiment III:  $t=-1.46$  ( $p>0.10$ );

The RAG index in Experiment II vs the RAG index in Experiment III:  $t=-1.21$  ( $p>0.10$ ).

<sup>6</sup> Firms inviting only heterosexual applicants for an interview:

adverse attitudes toward gay men as captured by the RAG index is higher in comparison to the one in Experiment I. The findings indicate that, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, firms excluding gay applicants expressed a higher level of adverse attitudes toward gay men than in 2006-2007. The difference in the RAG index between Experiments II and III is statistically insignificant and suggests that recruiters who favored heterosexual applicants shared comparable attitudes for gay men.

In addition, in Table 6, it is found that, in Experiments II and III the level of recruiters' taste- and statistical- discrimination attitudes toward gay men are higher in comparison to the one in Experiment I. That is, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, firms excluding gay applicants expressed a higher level of taste- and statistical discrimination- attitudes toward gay men than in 2006-2007. For instance, in Experiments II (; 3.28) and III (; 3.05) the level of recruiters' taste- discrimination attitude toward gay men as captured by the RAG item '*I feel that there is something wrong in a sexual relationship between two men*' is statistically significant higher in comparison to the one in Experiment I (; 2.80)<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, in Experiments II (; 3.40) and III (; 3.48) the level of recruiters' statistical- discrimination attitude toward gay men as captured by the RAG item '*I feel that male homosexuality relates to poor performance*' is statistically significant higher in comparison to the one in Experiment I (; 2.82)<sup>8</sup>.

Table 7 utilizes the RAG index and presents a 6x6 correlation matrix for gay applicants. Negative and statistically significant associations exist between the RAG index and gay applicants' access to occupations ( $r=-0.29$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) and wages ( $r=-0.24$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). That is, the higher the RAG index the lower the access to occupations for gay applicants, and the higher the wage sorting into lower-paid occupations for gay men. In addition, statistically significant results indicate that the higher the level of monthly unemployment the higher the RAG index ( $r=0.38$ ;  $p<0.01$ ), the lower the gay applicants' access to occupations ( $r=-0.31$ ;  $p<0.01$ ), and the higher the wage sorting into lower-paid occupations ( $r=-0.33$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) for gay applicants. Furthermore, the RAG index is higher in 2013-2014 ( $r=0.27$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) and in 2018-2019 ( $r=0.18$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) than in 2006-2007.

[Table 7]

Table 8 uses the RAG index and offers regressions on gay men's access to occupations and wages. In Model I, it is observed that the higher the RAG index the lower the access to occupations

---

The RAG index in Experiment I vs the RAG index in Experiment II:  $t=-6.0$  ( $p<0.01$ );

The RAG index in Experiment I vs the RAG index in Experiment III:  $t=-6.55$  ( $p<0.01$ );

The RAG index in Experiment II vs the RAG index in Experiment III:  $t=0.5$  ( $p>0.10$ ).

<sup>7</sup> The RAG item no. 1 in Experiment I vs the RAG item no. 1 in Experiment II:  $t=-6.2$  ( $p<0.01$ );

The RAG item no. 1. in Experiment I vs the RAG item no. 1 in Experiment III:  $t=-5.8$  ( $p<0.01$ ).

<sup>8</sup> The RAG item no. 4 in Experiment I vs the RAG item no. 4 in Experiment II:  $t=-6.4$  ( $p<0.01$ );

The RAG item no. 4 in Experiment I vs the RAG item no. 4 in Experiment III:  $t=-6.0$  ( $p<0.01$ ).

for gay men (-17.7%,  $p < 0.01$ ). That is, a one standard deviation increase in the RAG index indicates a 17.7% drop in access to occupations. Model II offers the wage estimates and observes that a one standard deviation increase in the RAG index brings a 1.6% ( $p < 0.10$ ) drop in wage prospects for gay applicants. Both models indicate that an increase in recruiters' biased attitudes against gay men potentially decreases gay applicants' access to occupations and increases wage sorting into lower-paid occupations<sup>9</sup>.

Finally, Models III and IV disentangle the RAG index into taste-based oriented attitudes (items 1, 2, and 3) and statistical-discrimination-oriented attitudes (items 4 and 5). Model III estimates that both taste- and statistical-discrimination oriented attitudes reduce gay men's access to occupations. A one standard deviation increase in taste-discrimination attitudes against gay men decreases their access to occupations by 9.6% ( $p < 0.01$ ). Furthermore, a one standard deviation increase in statistical-discrimination attitudes against gay men decreases their access to occupations by 8.1% ( $p < 0.01$ ). The difference between the two estimates is statistically insignificant ( $\chi^2 = 0.10$ ,  $p > 0.10$ ) and suggests that both theoretical arguments could explain the assigned patterns. In Model IV, the taste- and statistical-discrimination estimates are statistically insignificant.

[Table 8]

## 6. Discussion and conclusions

### 6.i Discussion of the findings

The study replicated the research protocol of the first European correspondence test on gay men in Greece which took place in 2006-2007 (Drydakis, 2009). The research found that, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, gay men experienced occupational access discrimination and wage sorting in lower-paid jobs. The study estimated increasing biased treatments in relation to occupational access discrimination and wage sorting in lower-paid jobs than in 2006-2007. The outcome of the study indicated that, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, gay men have to spend more time to receive an invitation for an interview, with any such invitation tending to come from a firm offering lower wages, which could affect future income. Gay men's access to invitations might not be free of discrimination, as long as they are accompanied by adverse wage sorting. Restricting people's equal workplace chances minimizes their potential, welfare, and sense of citizenship (Kalleberg, 2009).

Specifications indicated that both taste- and statistical- discrimination attitudes against gay men potentially reduced their access to occupations (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973; 1998; Becker, 1957; 1993). The findings suggested that, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, firms excluding gay

---

<sup>9</sup> Due to multicollinearity and overfitting, this study cannot include in the models, interaction effects between the RAG index and time controls.



applicants expressed a higher level of both taste- and statistical-discrimination attitudes toward gay men than in 2006-2007. The consideration of theoretical predictions of the taste for discrimination theory indicates that increasing taste-based attitudes due to a rise in homophobia could deteriorate gay men's labor market prospects (Drydakis, 2018). It is expected that rising homophobia might be associated with rising labor market discrimination against gay men (Drydakis, 2018). Moreover, by considering the statistical- discrimination hypothesis there are predictions that gay men will experience a greater disadvantage if the information regarding their average group characteristic proves increasing unreliable or wrong (Drydakis, 2018).

Based on the outcomes of the present study, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, there were rising disapprovals against same sex relationships and sexual orientation openness in the workplace. In addition, in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, there were rising concerns against gay men's labor market performance and commitment. The assigned patterns might reflect existing structural factors that oppress sexual orientation minorities which are magnified when rising taste- and statistical-discrimination attitudes are in evidence (Drydakis, 2009; 2018). It might be that the higher the adverse attitudes against gay men the higher the labor market discrimination against them.

The study suggests that in Greece, a gay rights backlash due to LGBTIQ+ group's attempt to advance its agenda (6.ii), a rising level of far-right rhetoric (6.iii), and hostile social environments related to the economic downturn (6.iv) might bear a relationship with biases against gay men.

#### *6.ii Gay rights backlash and gay men's workplace outcomes*

A backlash has traditionally been described as a reaction by members of dominant groups to any challenge to their values or status in which they seek to stop change (Drabble et al., 2021; Encarnación, 2020; Bishin et al., 2016; Culhane and Sobel, 2013). In Greece, no quantitative studies evaluate whether the public turns against policies in response to the LGBTIQ+ group's attempt to advance its agenda. However, a gay rights backlash due to the legalization of same-sex partnerships in 2015 possibly boosted biased treatments toward gay men.

Culhane and Sobel (2013) evaluated that where courts have found that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry, the push-back reaction has been '*swift, strong, and often nasty*' (pp. 448). The authors suggested that if gay marriage takes hold, all controversies and battles over equal recognition of same-sex relationships will be over (Culhane and Sobel, 2013). The concept posits that maintaining existing power arrangements and relationships motivates negative reactions to changes in the status quo (Bishin et al., 2016; Fejes, 2008; Sanbonmatsu, 2008). Bishin et al. (2016) evaluated that the public backlash may not just prevent the adoption of a policy but may also embolden a group's opponents and lead to the enactment of policies that make the group worse off than before it began.

Research indicates that the backlash may be evidenced by changes in people's opinions, including the attitudes expressed toward members of the group (Bishin et al., 2016). The present study, by comparing recruiters' attitudes that invited only heterosexual applicants, found that in 2013-2014 and 2018-2019, the level of their adverse beliefs toward gay men was higher in comparison to 2008-2009. The backlash literature suggests that increased exposure to events that make gay rights salient means attitudes should become more negative among those with strongly negative attitudes toward gay men (Bishin et al., 2016).

### *6.iii Rising far-right rhetoric and gay men's workplace outcomes*

Since 2012, the Greek literature indicated enhanced gender hierarchies as demonstrated by ethnonationalism claims, neofascism and homophobic proclamations accompanied economic hardships (Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015; Carastathis, 2015). In Greece, the rising poverty and uncertainty brought a rise of a far-right political party that legitimized racism and homophobia within the public sphere (Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015; Carastathis, 2015). Since 2015, the increased homophobic attacks and aggressiveness were attributed to the far-right rhetoric along with conservative positions in favor of traditional heterosexual family roles and values (Racist Violence Recording Network, 2018).

According to Doty et al. (1991), people gravitate toward extremist political parties during economic downturns because they provide prescriptions for behavior and mitigate uncertainty. In Greece, the far-right political party attempted to advance their social and political agenda by exploiting people's anger (United Nations, 2014). The party employed the twin fascism rhetoric of social decadence and national rebirth, and promised disillusioned Greek voters a nationalist solution to their socio-economic problems (Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou, 2015).

In Greece, over the last decade, LGBTIQ+ people were violently returned to their position as the 'others' (Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2015). There was an increase in the unequal ordering of sexualities, and homosexuality was deemed shameful and socially deviant, whereas heterosexuality was valued as the 'right' way to live (Racist Violence Recording Network, 2018; Papanikolaou, 2018; Eleftheriadis, 2017; 2015; Sroiter, 2014; Carastathis, 2015). Sexual minorities have found themselves under increased pressure to keep their sexuality separate from their families and professions for fear of being misread as sexually dangerous subjects (Racist Violence Recording Network, 2018; Sroiter, 2014).

#### *6.iv Rising unemployment and gay men's workplace outcomes*

The outcomes of the present study indicated that unemployment enhanced discriminatory workplace experiences for gay men. The results suggested that unemployment bears an association with higher occupational access constraints and higher wage sorting in vacancies offering lower remuneration for gay men during 2013-2014 and 2018-2019 compared to 2006-2007. Moreover, a positive association exists between unemployment and recruiters' biased attitudes toward gay men. Increasing unemployment can induce people without discriminatory attitudes to aggressively discriminate, even if such behavior is not maximized (Smith, 2012).

According to the social identity theory, increased unemployment encourages groups of people to form coalitions based on observed recognizable characteristics, such as ethnicity, when attempting to secure scarce jobs (Caselli and Coleman, 2013). Additionally, the realistic group conflict theory posits that a decline in resources prompts antagonism toward out-group members and intensifies intergroup competition (Taylor et al., 1978; LeVine and Campbell, 1972).

Studies found due to scarce resources individuals may evaluate minority groups as less valuable, worthy, and ethical (Krosch and Amodio, 2019; Bianchi et al., 2018; Jayadev and Johnson, 2017; Baker et al., 2016; Bianchi, 2016; Smith, 2012; Falk et al., 2011; Dustmann et al., 2010; Mayda, 2006). International studies indicated that economic downturns correlate with sex discrimination, xenophobia, hate crimes, intolerance, and the denial of fundamental human rights (Krosch and Amodio, 2019; Jayadev and Johnson, 2017; Bianchi et al., 2018; Baker et al., 2016; Bianchi, 2016). Economic studies have evaluated associations between economic downturns, rising racism, and adverse workplace outcomes for ethnic and racial minorities (Vargas et al., 2018; Jayadev and Johnson, 2017; Johnston and Lordan, 2016; Biddle and Hamermesh, 2013; Smith, 2012; Dustmann et al., 2010; Mayda, 2006).

The present study highlighted that in Greece, a gay rights backlash due to the legalization of same-sex partnerships, a rise in far-right conservative rhetoric, and hostility might have happened to coincide with a period characterized by more pronounced economic problems. In the present context, a gay rights backlash and far-right rhetoric remain empirically indistinguishable from attitudes related to economic conditions. Adverse economic conditions might not directly lead to increased homophobic behaviors by employers. Future studies will require research from new regions to assess whether the assigned patterns can be generalized beyond the Greek case.

Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou (2015) indicated that it would be misguided to assume that individuals' grievances automatically translate into far-right party mobilization. The Eurozone debt crisis affected other European countries, including Cyprus, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, and Spain, that did not experience a comparable rise in support for the far-right (Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou, 2015). The evaluation suggests that the Greek economic recession did not create those aspects but

simply brought forth a Greek conservatism and heterosexism that remained out of sight for some time (Papanikolaou and Kolocotroni, 2018; Carastathis, 2015).

#### *6.v Policy implications*

The empirical patterns of this study call for policy interventions. Based on the taste-discrimination, there is a need for policies to ban discriminators, in addition to the introduction of equality campaigns to reduce prejudice (Becker, 1957; 1993). The Greek government should attempt to affect public opinion and people's attitudes toward sexual orientation minorities (Drydakis, 2019). The present outcomes are noteworthy when considered in the context of the 2000 EU employment legislation (2000/78/EC) aimed at securing improvements in the EU labor market position of minority population groups. The utilization of statistical discrimination means employers should develop affordable tests to predict productivity, and social planners should introduce equality campaigns to reduce incorrect stereotypes (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973; 1998). In Greece, the lack of a public educational and informational instrument represents a critical factor preventing the achievement of social and labor equality (Drydakis, 2015b; 2011; 2012; 2009).

Positive workplace practices can reduce workplace biases against LGBTIQ+ people and foster positive payoffs in the labor market (Hossain et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2018). Anti-discrimination laws can reduce earnings penalties for gay men relative to heterosexual men (Delhomme, 2020). Working in a firm with a diversity and equity management policy can positively affect the earnings of gay men (Wang et al., 2018). Moreover, anti-discriminatory laws prohibiting discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation and LGBT workplace equality could spur innovation, firm performance, and marketing capability (Patel and Feng, 2020; Shan et al. 2016; Hossain et al., 2020; Johnson and Cooper, 2015).

#### *6.vi Limitations and future research*

The study's outcomes provide patterns but should not represent the average sexual orientation minority individual for various reasons. The study focused on the private sector and examined the workplace prospects of young and less-educated applicants. This took place because such a group of people demonstrated greater vulnerability to biased attitudes (Laurent and Mihoubi, 2012; Kara, 2006). New studies have to be conducted to examine whether the presented patterns can be verified in the public sector and for older and better-educated profiles. Moreover, the present study only examined four occupations. New studies examining additional occupations shall provide clearer patterns. Furthermore, research should consider that in reality, job offers can be obtained via networks and informal searches (Drydakis, 2011). Such an omission could affect the interpretation of the current results. Furthermore, the demographic characteristics of the recruiters and the

industrial characteristics of firms should be captured in subsequent studies, potentially resulting in additional insights.

Moreover, new studies might consider utilizing alternative sexual orientation labelling in the applications. Revealing the gender of the applicant's spouse might provide a stronger signal associated with greater biases (Ahmed et al., 2013). The study did not focus on lesbian women or other sexual orientation minority groups. It is of interest to examine comparable patterns for lesbian women, especially in this period where, contrary to the earlier literature, lesbian women have been found to receive lower wages in comparison to heterosexual women (Drydakis and Zimmermann, 2020; Drydakis, 2019; Martell, 2020; Bryson, 2017).

The present study found that recruiters' biased attitudes toward gay men increased and that gay applicants experienced higher occupational access constraints and greater wage sorting in lower-paid occupations. However, the findings do not reveal whether those who received an invitation for an interview might experience further bias. A combination of experimental and administrative data sources and meta-analyses are required to assess minority populations' experiences in the labor market.

## References

- Ahmed, A. M. Andersson, L. and Hammarstedt, M. (2013). Are Gay Men and Lesbians Discriminated against in the Hiring Process? *Southern Economic Journal*, 79(3): 565-585.
- Arrow, K. J. (1973). The Theory of Discrimination, in O. Ashenfelter and A. Rees (Eds), *Discrimination in Labor Markets* (pp. 3-42). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Arrow, K. J. (1998). What Has Economics to Say About Racial Discrimination? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2): 91-100.
- Badgett, M. V. L. (2020). *The Economic Case for LGBT Equality. Why Fair and Equal Treatment Benefits Us All*. Boston, MA.: Beacon Press.
- Baert, S. (2018): Hiring Discrimination: An Overview of (Almost) All Correspondence Experiments Since 2005, in M. Gaddis (Ed.). *Audit Studies: Behind the Scenes with Theory, Method, and Nuance* (pp. 63-77). New York: Springer.
- Baker, S. R. Bloom, N. and Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring Economic Policy Uncertainty. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4): 1593–1636.
- Becker, G.S. (1957). *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, G.S. (1993). Nobel Lecture: The Economic Way of Looking at Behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*, 101(3): 385-409.
- Bianchi, E. C. (2016). American Individualism Rises and Falls with the Economy: Cross-Temporal Evidence that Individualism Declines when the Economy Falts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111(4): 567–584.
- Bianchi, E. C. Hall, E. V. and Lee, S. (2018). Reexamining the Link Between Economic Downturns and Racial Antipathy: Evidence That Prejudice Against Blacks Rises During Recessions. *Psychological Science*, 29(10) 1584–1597.
- Bishin, B. G., Hayes, T. J. Incantalupo, M. B. and Smith, C. A. (2016). Opinion Backlash and Public Attitudes: Are Political Advances in Gay Rights Counterproductive? *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(3): 625–648.
- Bryson, A. (2017). Pay Equity after the Equality Act 2010: Does Sexual Orientation Still Matter? *Work, Employment and Society*, 31(3): 483-500.
- Caselli, F. and Coleman, W. J. (2013). On the Theory of Ethnic Conflict. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11: 161-192.
- Carastathis, A. (2015). The Politics of Austerity and the Affective Economy of Hostility: Racialised Gendered Violence and Crises of Belonging in Greece. *Feminist Review*, 109(1): 73-95.
- Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Culhane, G. J. and Sobel, L. S. (2013). The Gay Marriage Backlash and Its Spillover Effects: Lessons from a (Slightly) Blue State. *Tulsa Law Review*, 40(3): 443-446.
- Delhommer, S. (2020). Effect of State and Local Sexual Orientation Anti-Discrimination Laws on Labor Market Differentials. *Social Science Research Network SSRN*: June 16, 2020.
- Doty, R. M. Peterson, B. E. and Winter, D. G. (1991). Threat and Authoritarianism in the United States, 1978–1987. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4): 629–640.
- Dustmann, C. Glitz, A. Vogel, T. 2010. Employment, Wages, and the Economic Cycle: Differences Between Immigrants and Natives. *European Economic Review*, 54(1),1–17.
- Drabble, L. A. Wootton, A. R. Veldhuis, C. B. Riggle, E. D. B. Rostosky, S. S. Lannutti, P. J. Balsam, K. F. and Hughes T. L. (2021). Perceived Psychosocial Impacts of Legalized Same-Sex Marriage: A Scoping Review of Sexual Minority Adults' Experiences. *PLoS ONE*, 16(5): e0249125.
- Drydakis, N. (2009). Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Labour Market. *Labour Economics*, 16(4): 364-372.
- Drydakis, N. (2011). Women's Sexual Orientation and Labor Market Outcomes in Greece. *Feminist Economics*, 11(1):89-117.
- Drydakis, N. (2012). Sexual Orientation and Labour Relations New Evidence from Athens, Greece. *Applied Economics*, 44(20): 2653-2665.

- Drydakis, N. (2014). Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Cypriot Labour Market. Tastes or Uncertainty? *International Journal of Manpower*, 35(5): 720 – 744.
- Drydakis Nick (2015a). Measuring Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the UK's Labour Market; A Field Experiment. *Human Relations*, 68(11): 1769-1796.
- Drydakis, N. (2015b). Effect of Sexual Orientation on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Greece. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 54(1): 162-187.
- Drydakis, N. (2015c). The Effect of Unemployment on Self-reported Health and Mental Health in Greece from 2008 to 2013: A Longitudinal Study Before and During the Financial Crisis. *Social Science and Medicine*, 128: 43-51.
- Drydakis, N. (2018). Economic Pluralism in the Study of Wage Discrimination: A Note. *International Journal of Manpower*, 39(4): 631-636.
- Drydakis, N. (2019). *Sexual Orientation and Labor Market Outcomes*. IZA World of Labor No 111.v2. Bonn: IZA World of Labor.
- Drydakis, N. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2020). Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Labour Market Outcomes: New Patterns and Insights. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(6): 621-628.
- Drydakis, N. (2021, in-print). Sexual Orientation and Earnings. A Meta-Analysis 2012-2020. *Journal of Population Economics*.
- Eurobarometer (2019). Special Eurobarometer 493. Discrimination in the European Union: The Social Acceptance of LGBTI People in the EU. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA, 2020). A Long Way to Go for LGBTI Equality. Brussels: FRA.
- Eurostat (2019). *Greece: Unemployment Rate*. Luxemburg: Statistical Office of the European Commission.
- Eleftheriadis, K. (2015). Queer Responses to Austerity: Insights from the Greece of Crisis. *ACME: An International e-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 14(4): 1032-1057.
- Eleftheriadis, K. (2017). Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, and Sexual Politics in the European Periphery: A Multiscalar Analysis of Gay Prides in Thessaloniki, Greece', *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 30(4): 385-398.
- Encarnación, G. O. (2020). The Gay Rights Backlash: Contrasting Views from the United States and Latin America. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 22(4) 654–665.
- Falk, A. Kuhn, A. and Zweimuller, J. (2011). Unemployment and Right-Wing Extremist Crime. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 113 (2): 260–285.
- Fejes, F. (2008). *Gay Rights and Moral Panic: The Origin of America's Debate on Homosexuality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flage, A. (2020). Discrimination Against Gays and Lesbians in Hiring Decisions: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(6): 671-691.
- Jayadev, A. and Johnson, R. (2017). Tides and Prejudice: Racial Attitudes During Downturns in the United States 1979–2014. *Review of Black Political Economy*, 44: 379–392.
- Johnson, I. and Cooper, D. (2015). LGBT Diversity: Show me the Business Case. Utrecht: Out Now
- Johnston, D. W. and Lordan, G. (2016). Racial Prejudice and Labour Market Penalties During Economic Downturns. *European Economic Review*, 84(May): 57-75.
- Hammarstedt, M. Ahmed, A. M. and Andersson, L. (2015). Sexual Prejudice and Labor Market Outcomes for Gays and Lesbians: Evidence from Sweden. *Feminist Economics*, 21(1): 90-109.
- Hoffnar, E. and Greene, M. (1996). Gender Discrimination in the Public and Private Sectors: A Sample Selectivity Approach. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 25(1): 105-114.
- Hossain, M. Atif, M. Ahmed, A. and Mia, L. (2020). Do LGBT Workplace Diversity Policies Create Value for Firms? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167: 775-791.

- International Monetary Fund (2013). *Greece: Ex Post Evaluation of Exceptional Access Under the 2010 Stand by Arrangement. No. 13/156*. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Jayadev, A. and Johnson, R. (2017). Tides and Prejudice: Racial Attitudes During Downturns in the United States 1979–2014. *Review of Black Political Economy*, 44: 379–392.
- Kalleberg, A.L. (2009). Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1): 1-22.
- Kara, O. (2006). Occupational Gender Wage Discrimination in Turkey. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 33(2): 130-143.
- Krosch, A. R. and Amodio, D. M. (2019). Scarcity Disrupts the Neural Encoding of Black Faces: A Socioperceptual Pathway to Discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 117(5): 859-875.
- Laurent, T. and Mihoubi, F. (2012). Sexual Orientation and Wage Discrimination in France: The Hidden Side of the Rainbow. *Journal of Labor Research*, 33: 487–527.
- LeVine, A. R. and Campbell, T. D. (1972). *Ethnocentrism*. New York: John Wiley.
- Martell, M. (2020). Age and the New Lesbian Earnings Penalty. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(6): 649-670.
- Mayda, A. M. (2006). Who is Against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes Toward Immigrants. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88 (3): 510–530.
- Neumark, D. (2018) Experimental Research on Labor Market Discrimination. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 56(3): 799–866.
- Racist Violence Recording Network (2018). *Annual Report: 2018*. Athens: Racist Violence Recording Network.
- Riach, P. A. and Rich, J. (2002). Field Experiments of Discrimination in the Market Place. *The Economic Journal*, 112(483): 480–518.
- OECD (2019). *Society at a Glance 2019. OECD Social Indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- Oreffice, S. (2011). Sexual Orientation and Household Decision Making. Same-Sex Couples Balance of Power and Labor Supply Choices. *Labour Economics*, 18(2): 145-158.
- Patacchini, E. Ragusa, G. and Zenou, Y. (2015). Unexplored Dimensions of Discrimination in Europe: Homosexuality and Physical Appearance. *Journal of Population Economics*, 28: 1045–1073.
- Papadimitriou, D. (2014). The Golden Dawn and the Extreme Right in Greece. *E-International Relations*, March: 1-4.
- Papanastasiou, S. and Papatheodorou, C. (2018). The Greek Depression: Poverty Outcomes and Welfare Responses. *Journal of Economics and Business*, XXI(1-2): 205-222.
- Papanikolaou, D. and Kolocotroni, V. (2018). New Queer Greece: Performance, Politics and Identity in Crisis. *Journal of Greek Media and Culture*, 4(2): 143-150.
- Papanikolaou, D. (2018). Critically Queer and Haunted: Greek Identity, Crisiscapes and Doing Queer History in the Present. *Journal of Greek Media and Culture*, 4(2): 167-186.
- Papatheodorou, C. (2014). Economic Crisis, Poverty and Deprivation in Greece. The Impact of Neoliberal Remedies, in S. Mavroudeas (Ed.) *Greek Capitalism in Crisis: Marxist Analyses* (pp. 179-195), London: Routledge.
- Patel, P. C. and Feng, C. (2021). LGBT Workplace Equality Policy and Customer Satisfaction: The Roles of Marketing Capability and Demand Instability. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 40(1): 7-26.
- Phelps, E. (1972). The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism. *American Economic Review*, 62(4): 659-661.
- Psarras, D. (2015). *Golden Dawn on Trial*. Athens: Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2008). Gender Backlash in American Politics? *Politics and Gender*, 4: 634–642.
- Shan, L. Fu, S. and Zheng, L. (2016). Corporate Sexual Equality and Firm Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(9): 1812-1826.
- Sroiter, A. (2014). *Autopsy: Homophobic Attacks*. Athens: Alpha TV.



- Smith, J. (2012). Reputation, Social Identity and Social Conflict. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 14(4): 677–709.
- Taylor, S. E. Fiske, S. T. Etcoff, N. L. and Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and Contextual Bases of Person Memory and Stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(7): 778–793.
- Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(2): 586-626.
- United Nations (2014). *Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 40 of the Covenant*. New York: United Nations.
- Valfort, A. M. (2020). *Over the Rainbow? The Road to LGBTI Inclusion*. Paris: OECD.
- Vasilopoulou, S. and Halikiopoulou, D. (2015). *The Golden Dawn's 'Nationalist Solution': Explaining the Rise of the Far Right in Greece*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vargas, E. D. Huyser, K. R. Ybarra, V. D. Hollis, J. and Sanchez, G. R. (2018). The Influence of the Great Recession on Racial Attitudes Among Non-Hispanic Whites in the United States. *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy*, 1: 196–203.
- Wang, J. Gunderson, M. and Wicks, D. (2018). The Earnings Effect of Sexual Orientation: British Evidence from Worker-Firm Matched Data. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 56(4): 744–769.
- Weichselbaumer, D. (2003). Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring. *Labour Economics*, 10: 629–642.
- Zavodny, M. (2008). Is There a Marriage Premium For Gay Men? *Review of the Economics of the Household*, 6: 369–389.

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics. Access to occupations**

Outcomes  Jobs	Jobs	Neither Invited	At least one invited	Both invited	Only heterosexual men were invited	Only gay men were invited	Net discrimination		$\chi^2$ test
			(1)		(2)	(3)	(2)-(3)	[(2)-(3)]/(1) %	
Panel I: 2006-2007 period (Experiment I)									
Office jobs	455	268	187	46	140	1	139	74.33	137.02*
Industrial jobs	346	215	131	40	89	2	87	66.41	83.17*
Restaurants and café services	511	342	169	57	110	2	108	63.9	104.14*
Shop sales	402	193	209	87	118	4	114	54.54	106.52*
Total	1714	1018	696	230	457	9	448	64.36	430.69*
Panel II: 2013-2014 period (Experiment II)									
Office jobs	328	213	115	12	102	1	101	87.82	99.03*
Industrial jobs	301	206	95	7	88	0	88	92.63	88*
Restaurants and café services	259	190	69	12	56	1	55	79.71	53.07*
Shop sales	327	199	128	5	122	1	121	94.53	120.00*
Total	1215	808	407	36	368	3	365	89.68	359.09*
Panel III: 2018-2019 period (Experiment III)									
Office jobs	276	173	103	11	91	1	90	87.37	88.04*
Industrial jobs	258	178	80	14	65	1	64	80	62.06*
Restaurants and café services	331	180	151	10	141	0	141	93.37	141*
Shop sales	282	214	68	11	56	1	55	80.88	53.07*
Total	1147	745	402	46	353	3	350	87.06	244.14*

Notes: The null hypothesis is “Both applicants are treated unfavourably equally often,” that is, (2) = (3). \*Statistically significant at the 1% level.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics. Wages**

	Heterosexual men	Gay men	Difference	Percentage	t-test
	(1)	(2)	(1)-(2)	$[(1)-(2)]/(1)$ %	
<b>Panel I: 2006-2007 period</b>					
Office jobs	4.73 (56)	4.43 (16)	0.29	6.13	2.26*
Industrial jobs	4.57 (43)	4.16 (16)	0.41	8.97	3.49*
Restaurants and café services	4.17 (45)	4.09 (17)	0.08	1.91	1.48
Shop sales	4.20 (71)	3.96 (30)	0.24	5.71	3.75*
Total	4.41 (215)	4.12 (79)	0.29	6.57	5.18*
<b>Panel II: 2013-2014 period</b>					
Office jobs	4.26 (25)	3.79 (8)	0.47	11.03	3.77*
Industrial jobs	4.04 (29)	3.66 (6)	0.38	9.40	3.40*
Restaurants and café services	3.92 (21)	3.63 (6)	0.29	7.39	2.95*
Shop sales	3.97 (34)	3.72 (13)	0.25	6.29	3.11*
Total	4.05 (109)	3.71 (33)	0.34	8.39	6.16*
<b>Panel III: 2018-2019 period</b>					
Office jobs	4.31 (34)	3.85 (4)	0.46	10.67	3.39*
Industrial jobs	4.25 (22)	3.76 (6)	0.49	11.52	3.81*
Restaurants and café services	4.04 (37)	3.7 (5)	0.34	8.41	3.37*
Shop sales	4.02 (24)	3.6 (5)	0.42	10.44	3.16*
Total	4.15 (117)	3.73 (20)	0.42	10.12	6.45*

*Notes: Net hourly wages. Observations are given in the parentheses. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level.*

**Table 3. Estimates. Access to occupations**

	Model I Experiment I 2006-2007	Model II Experiment II 2013-2014	Model III Experiment III 2018-2019	Model IV Experiments I-II-III	Model V Experiments I-II-III
Gay men <sup>^</sup>	-0.264 (0.014)*	-0.280 (0.000)*	-0.304 (0.015)*	-0.282 (0.008)*	-0.221 (0.012)*
Industrial jobs <sup>^^</sup>	-0.007 (0.022)	-0.022 (0.019)	-0.017 (0.020)	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.014 (0.012)
Restaurants and café services <sup>^^</sup>	-0.034 (0.020)***	-0.016 (0.020)	0.031 (0.019)	-0.008 (0.012)	-0.008 (0.012)
Shop sales <sup>^^</sup>	0.119 (0.023)*	0.027 (0.020)	-0.057 (0.018)*	0.040 (0.013)*	0.039 (0.013)*
2013-2014 period <sup>^^^</sup>	-	-	-	-0.071 (0.014)*	-0.035 (0.017)**
2018-2019 period <sup>^^^</sup>	-	-	-	-0.062 (0.015)*	-0.019 (0.017)
Gay men × 2013-2014 period	-	-	-	-	-0.093 (0.017)*
Gay men × 2018-2019 period	-	-	-	-	-0.111 (0.016)*
LR $\chi^2$	365.31	358.26	407.13	1086.95	1127.52
Prob> $\chi^2$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.091	0.152	0.179	0.125	0.129
Log likelihood	-1817.1	-997.0	-929.2	-3800.15	-3779.81
Observations	3428	2430	2294	8152	8152

Notes: Probit estimates reporting marginal effects. (^) The reference category is heterosexual men. (^^) The reference category is office jobs. (^^^) The reference category is 2006-2007 period. The models control for CV type, sending order and type. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level. \*\*Statistically significant at the 5% level. \*\*\*Statistically significant at the 10% level.

**Table 4. Estimates. Wages**

	Model I Experiment I 2006-2007	Model II Experiment II 2013-2014	Model III Experiment III 2018-2019	Model IV Experiments I-II-III	Model V Experiments I-II-III
Gay men <sup>^</sup>	-0.039 (0.006)*	-0.057 (0.009)*	-0.071 (0.010)*	-0.051 (0.005)*	-0.040 (0.000)*
Industrial jobs <sup>^^</sup>	-0.029 (0.009)*	-0.038 (0.011)*	-0.008 (0.010)	-0.025 (0.006)*	-0.025 (0.006)*
Restaurants and café services <sup>^^</sup>	-0.076 (0.009)*	-0.059 (0.011)*	-0.042 (0.009)*	-0.059 (0.006)*	-0.059 (0.006)*
Shop sales <sup>^^</sup>	-0.079 (0.008)*	-0.046 (0.010)*	-0.047 (0.010)*	-0.061 (0.005)*	-0.061 (0.005)*
2013-2014 period <sup>^^^</sup>	-	-	-	-0.070 (0.007)*	-0.064 (0.008)*
2018-2019 period <sup>^^^</sup>	-	-	-	-0.053 (0.007)*	-0.045 (0.008)*
Gay men × 2013-2014 period				-	-0.018 (0.011)
Gay men × 2018-2019 period				-	-0.032 (0.013)**
F	26.24	12.22	13.13	46.65	39.05
Prob> F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.340	0.357	0.384	0.418	0.422
Root MSE	0.052	0.045	0.042	0.050	0.049
Observations	294	142	137	573	573

*Notes: OLS natural logarithm of net hourly wage estimates. (^) The reference category is heterosexual men. (^^) The reference category is office jobs. (^^^) The reference category is 2006-2007 period. The models control for CV type, sending order and type. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level. \*\*Statistically significant at the 5% level.*

**Table 5. Estimates. Access to occupations and wages**

	Model I Access to occupations^ Experiments I-II-III	Model II Access to occupations^ Experiments I-II-III	Model III Wages^^ Experiments I-II-III	Model IV Wages^^ Experiments I-II-III	Model V Access to occupations^ Experiments I-II-III	Model VI Wages^^ Experiments I-II-III
Gay men <sup>#</sup>	-0.282 (0.008)*	-0.178 (0.020)*	-0.050 (0.005)*	-0.033 (0.010)*	-0.221 (0.012)*	-0.041 (0.006)*
Monthly unemployment level	-0.003 (0.000)*	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.003 (0.000)*	-0.003 (0.000)*	0.006 (0.010)	0.001 (0.005)
Industrial jobs <sup>##</sup>	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.025 (0.006)*	-0.025 (0.006)*	-0.014 (0.012)	-0.025 (0.006)*
Restaurants and café services <sup>##</sup>	-0.009 (0.012)	-0.008 (0.012)	-0.060 (0.006)*	-0.060 (0.006)*	-0.008 (0.012)	-0.059 (0.006)*
Shop sales <sup>##</sup>	0.040 (0.013)*	0.039 (0.013)*	-0.060 (0.005)*	-0.060 (0.005)*	0.039 (0.013)**	-0.061 (0.005)*
Gay men × Monthly unemployment level	-	-0.006 (0.001)*	-	-0.001 (0.000)***	-	-
2013-2014 period <sup>###</sup>	-	-	-	-	-0.147 (0.157)	-0.080 (0.097)
2018-2019 period <sup>###</sup>	-	-	-	-	-0.078 (0.088)	-0.054 (0.048)
Gay men × Monthly unemployment level × 2013-2014 period <sup>###</sup>	-	-	-	-	-0.003 (0.001)*	-0.001 (0.001)
Gay men × Monthly unemployment level × 2018-2019 period <sup>###</sup>	-	-	-	-	-0.007 (0.001)*	-0.001 (0.000)**
LR x <sup>2</sup>	1080.48	1110.33	-	-	1127.93	-
Prob> x <sup>2</sup>	0.000	0.000	-	-	0.000	-
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.124	0.127	-	-	0.129	-
Log likelihood	-3803.39	-3788.46	-	-	-3779.66	-
Observations	8152	8152	-	-	8152	-
F	-	-	50.24	45.21	-	35.72
Prob> F	-	-	0.000	0.000	-	0.000
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	-	-	0.407	0.419	-	0.421
Root MSE	-	-	0.050	0.050	-	0.049
Observations	-	-	573	573	-	573

Notes: (^) Probit estimates reporting marginal effects (^^) OLS natural logarithm of net hourly wage estimates. (#) The reference category is heterosexual men. (##) The reference category is office jobs. (###) The reference category is 2006-2007 period. The models control for CV type, sending order and type. Standard errors are in parentheses.

\*Statistically significant at the 1% level. \*\*Statistically significant at the 5% level. \*\*\*Statistically significant at the 10% level.

**Table 6. Descriptive statistics. Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men (The RAG index)**

	Panel I Experiment I 2006-2007			Panel II Experiment II 2013-2014			Panel III Experiment III 2018-2019		
	Firms invited for interviews both heterosexual and gay applicants	Firms invited for interviews only heterosexual applicants	t-test	Firms invited for interviews both heterosexual and gay applicants	Firms invited for interviews only heterosexual applicants	t-test	Firms invited for interviews both heterosexual and gay applicants	Firms invited for interviews only heterosexual applicants	t-test
Item 1. I feel that there is something wrong in a sexual relationship between two men	2.36 (0.97)	2.8 (1.20)	t=-0.44	2.54 (1.21)	3.28 (0.96)	t=-1.86***	2.42 (0.51)	3.05 (0.92)	t=-3.13*
Item 2. I feel that male homosexuality is a negative factor in one's life	3.33 (0.89)	3.41 (0.93)	t=-2.7*	3.55 (1.21)	3.64 (1.10)	t=-2.35*	3.57 (0.93)	3.60 (1.02)	t=-2.44*
Item 3. I feel that gay men should hide their sexual orientation in the workplace to protect vocational relationships and the firm's reputation	2.6 (1.15)	2.67 (1.11)	t=-0.57	2.8 (1.32)	3.39 (0.91)	t=-0.29	2.93 (1.07)	3.48 (1.04)	t=-1.84
Item 4. I feel that male homosexuality relates to poor performance	2.67 (0.82)	2.82 (0.87)	t=-1.20	2.81 (1.32)	3.40 (0.96)	t=-1.82***	2.78 (0.97)	3.48 (0.89)	t=-2.66*
Item 5. I feel that male homosexuality bears a relationship to higher employee turnover in terms of gay men	2.58 (0.77)	2.74 (0.82)	t=-1.37	2.90 (1.22)	3.48 (0.86)	t=-1.99**	2.78 (0.97)	3.30 (0.54)	t=-2.88*
Total: The RAG index per event	2.71 (0.44)	2.88 (0.50)	t=-2.57*	2.92 (0.69)	3.44 (0.83)	t=-1.96**	2.9 (0.42)	3.38 (0.55)	t=-3.13*
Total: The RAG index joint events (firms invited for interviews both heterosexual and gay applicants and firms invited for interviews only heterosexual applicants)	2.81 (0.48)			3.39 (0.83)			3.31 (0.56)		
Number of firms	84	120		11	97		14	78	

Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level. \*\*Statistically significant at the 5% level. \*\*\*Statistically significant at the 10% level.

**Table 7. Correlation matrix. Restricted sample on gay men**

	Gay applicants' access to occupations	Net hourly wages	Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men (The RAG index)	Monthly unemployment	2013-2014 period ^	2018-2019 period ^
Gay applicants' access to occupations	1					
Net hourly wages	-0.251 (0.001)*	1				
Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men (The RAG index)	-0.294 (0.000)*	-0.249 (0.001)*	1			
Monthly unemployment	-0.310 (0.000)*	-0.336 (0.000)*	0.381 (0.000)*	1		
2013-2014 period ^	-0.228 (0.000)*	-0.294 (0.000)*	0.277 (0.000)*	0.882 (0.000)*	1	
2018-2019 period ^	-0.143 (0.003)*	-0.053 (0.498)	0.186 (0.000)*	0.151 (0.002)*	-0.328 (0.000)*	1

Notes: (^) The reference category is 2006-2007 period. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level.



<b>Table 8. Estimates. Access to occupations and wages. Restricted sample on gay men</b>				
	Model I Access to occupations^ Experiments I-II-III	Model II Wages^^ Experiments I-II-III	Model III Access to occupations^ Experiments I-II-III	Model IV Wages^^ Experiments I-II-III
Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men (The RAG index)	-0.177 (0.039)*	-0.016 (0.009)***	-	-
Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men: <i>Taste-discrimination items</i>	-	-	-0.096 (0.003)*	-0.012 (0.009)
Recruiters' attitudes toward gay men: <i>Statistical-discrimination items</i>	-	-	-0.081 (0.030)*	-0.003 (0.009)
Industrial jobs <sup>#</sup>	0.036 (0.069)	-0.027 (0.018)	-0.037 (0.069)	-0.026 (0.018)
Restaurants and café services <sup>#</sup>	0.013 (0.063)	-0.070 (0.017)*	0.014 (0.063)	-0.070 (0.017)*
Shop sales <sup>#</sup>	0.098 (0.067)	-0.081 (0.017)*	0.096 (0.067)	-0.080 (0.017)*
2013-2014 period <sup>##</sup>	-0.209 (0.070)**	-0.061 (0.025)**	-0.210 (0.070)**	-0.061 (0.025)*
2018-2019 period <sup>##</sup>	-0.137 (0.079)	-0.021 (0.024)	-0.138 (0.079)	-0.022 (0.024)
LR $\chi^2$	66.49	-	66.65	-
Prob> $\chi^2$	0.000	-	0.000	-
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.141	-	0.141	-
Log likelihood	-202.31	-	-202.23	-
Observations	404	-	404	-
F	-	7.20	-	6.46
Prob> F	-	0.000	-	0.000
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	-	0.256	-	0.252
Root MSE	-	0.075	-	0.075
Observations	-	163	-	163

Notes: (^) Probit estimates reporting marginal effects. (^^) OLS natural logarithm of net hourly wage estimates. (#) The reference category is office jobs. (##) The reference category is 2006-2007 period. The models control for sectors, CV type, sending order and type. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*Statistically significant at the 1% level. \*\*Statistically significant at the 5% level. \*\*\*Statistically significant at the 10% level.

## Appendix. Greece. Macroeconomic indicators, LGBTIQ+ acceptance indicators and politics

Macroeconomic indicators	LGBTIQ+ acceptance indicators	Far-right political party	Institutional policies
In <b>2006-2007</b> , the unemployment rate was 8.7%, the GDP was 295.9b, the growth rate was 4.5%, the rate of people living at risk of poverty or social exclusion was 20%. <sup>(1)</sup>			In January <b>2005</b> the 3304/2005 Law combated discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation in the workplace. <sup>(9,10)</sup>
In <b>2013-2014</b> , the unemployment rate was 26.9%, the GDP was 238.4b, the growth rate was -1.2%, the rate of people living at risk of poverty or social exclusion was 35.1%. <sup>(1)</sup>	In <b>2012-2014</b> , verbal abuse and physical violence against LGBTIQ+ people increased. Organized street gangs were formed, and persecutions against LGBTIQ+ people took place across the country. <sup>(2)</sup> Between <b>2013</b> and <b>2019</b> , reportages in the popular international press indicated that homophobia escalated. <sup>(3)</sup>	In the <b>2012</b> parliamentary elections a far-right political party won 7% of the vote, finished third in the <b>2014</b> European elections (9.4%), and gained third place in the parliamentary elections of <b>2015</b> (6.4%). <sup>(8)</sup>	In December <b>2015</b> , the 4356/2015 Law legalized same-sex partnerships. <sup>(9,10)</sup>
In <b>2018-2019</b> , the unemployment rate was 18.2%, the GDP was 213.9b, the growth rate was 1.8%, the rate of people living at risk of poverty or social exclusion was 31.8%. <sup>(1)</sup>	<p>The <b>2018</b> annual report of the Racist Violence Recording Network revealed increased homophobic attacks, aggressiveness, and anger since <b>2015</b>. <sup>(4)</sup></p> <p>The <b>2019</b> OECD report found that the country experienced a decreased acceptance of homosexuality. <sup>(5)</sup></p> <p>The <b>2019</b> Eurobarometer survey suggested that more homophobia existed in Greece than the EU28 average. <sup>(6)</sup></p> <p>The <b>2020</b> European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights survey indicated that the shares of EU respondents who felt discriminated against were highest in Greece. <sup>(7)</sup></p>	<p>During the <b>2019</b> European elections the far-right political party won 4.8% of the vote and during the <b>2019</b> parliamentary election lost all of its seats in the Hellenic Parliament, winning only 2.9% of the vote. <sup>(8)</sup></p> <p>In October <b>2020</b>, a court ruled that nearly the entire leadership of the far-right political party will be imprisoned for operating a criminal gang under the guise of being a political party. <sup>(8)</sup></p>	In October <b>2017</b> the 4491/2017 Law permitted people to legally change their gender on all official documents without undergoing sterilization. <sup>(9,10)</sup>

Notes: Resources <sup>(1)</sup>: Eurostat database, World Bank database, Hellenic Statistical Authority database. <sup>(2)</sup> Sroiter, A. (2014). *Autopsy: Homophobic Attacks*. Athens: Alpha TV. <sup>(3)</sup> BBC News, 2 October 2013; *The Guardian*, 7 September 2014; *The New York Times*, 5 October 2015; *Deutsche Welle*, 2 May 2017; *The EU Observer*, 28 May 2018; *TRT World*, 19 April 2019; *The Independent*, 1 March 2019. <sup>(4)</sup> Racist Violence Recording Network (2018). *Annual Report: 2018*. Athens: Racist Violence Recording Network. <sup>(5)</sup> OECD (2019). *Society at a Glance 2019. OECD Social Indicators*. Paris: OECD. <sup>(6)</sup> Eurobarometer (2019). *Special Eurobarometer 493. Discrimination in the European Union: The Social Acceptance of LGBTI People in the EU*. Brussels: European Commission. <sup>(7)</sup> European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA, 2020). *A Long Way to Go for LGBTI Equality*. Brussels: FRA. <sup>(8)</sup> *The New York Times*, 7 October 2020; BBC News, 7 October 2020; CNN News, 8 October 2020. <sup>(9)</sup> *The Guardian*, 23 December 2015. <sup>(10)</sup> *The Guardian*, 10 October 2017.